Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

Fiscal Year	2014	CFDA/Subprogram	84.215J	Schedule	1	Tier	1
				No		No	

Panel Full Service Community

Name Schools - 12

Applicant Name Columbia College Chicago PR/Award No U215J140035

Questions

		Points Possible	Points Scored
1. Selection Criteria			
Project Design		25	22
Adequacy of Resources		20	20
Management Plan		25	22
Project Services		20	18
Project Evaluation		10	10
	TOTAL	100	92

Priority Questions

1. Competitive Preference Priority: Promise Zones

CPP: Promise Zones		3	0
	TOTAL	3	0
	GRAND TOTAL	103	92

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name Columbia College Chicago PR/Award No U215J140035

Reviewer Name

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

- 1. (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project.
 - (2) In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of:
 - (i) The students, students' family members, and community to be served, including information about the demographic characteristics and needs of the students, students' family members, and other community members and the estimated number of individuals to be served; and
 - (ii) The eligible services (as listed in the Absolute Priority described elsewhere in the notice inviting applications) to be provided or coordinated by the applicant and its partner entities, how those services will meet the needs of students, students' family members, and other community members, and the frequency with which those services will be provided to students, students' family members, and community members.

(iii) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits

into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.

(iv) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related

efforts to improve relevant outcomes using existing funding stream from other programs or

policies supported by community State and Federal Resources.

STRENGTHS:

The applicant does an exemplary job demonstrating the needs of the communities, families and

students to be served on pages 2 through 5. This section was strengthened by the discussion of

existing resources and why they are not meeting current needs.

Eligible services are described in detail and address (1) Remedial education and academic

enrichment activities that will improve academic performance and enhance real-life, inquirybased cultural and social skills; (2) Programs that promote parental involvement and family

literacy to engage all school stakeholders and embrace parents as partners in their children's

learning; and (3) Mentoring and other youth development programs to improve the personal,

social, and cultural development of students.

The applicant plans to address sustainability issues during the final year of the grant, and

intends to create a manual that can be used to guide replication efforts and institutionalize the approach into the ongoing work of the Chicago Public Schools (page 14). The applicant plans to

implement arts-focused programs that have been developed using other resources at the

project sites.

WEAKNESSES:

It is not clear how many students will be served by the academic enrichment, tutoring, and

youth development programs or if they all take place after school. This is potentially problematic as access to the programs may be limited for the neediest students. They also fail

to address sustainability at the outset of this work, for example by seeking ways the approach

could be fully integrated into the school day.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 22

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

2. (1) The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project.

(2) In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers

the following factors:

(i) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources to

be provided by the applicant and consortium partners;

(ii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to

the implementation and success of the project; and

(iii) The extent to which costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be

served and services to be provided.

STRENGTHS:

The resources, facilities, equipment and supplies appear well suited to the needs of the project.

All partners in this work have demonstrated their commitment through signed MOUs and letters of commitment. Many are also contributing in-kind or matching resources. For example, each partner school has agreed to host programs and make classrooms, auditorium, technology and other needed resources available. The schools have also agreed to open on Saturdays and

in the evening for family and community events. The applicant Columbia College is also making

their facility available for events and field trips.

The costs are reasonable and include funding for supplies typically needed for high quality arts

and after-school programs.

WEAKNESSES:

None noted.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

3. (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project.

(2) In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary

considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a

description of planning, coordination, management, and oversight of the eligible services (as listed in the Absolute Priority described elsewhere in the notice inviting applications) to be provided at each school to be served, including the role of the school principal, the FSCS

coordinator, partner entities, parents, and community members;

(ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the FSCS coordinator and

other key project personnel including prior performance of the applicant on similar or related

efforts; and

(iii) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director, the FSCS coordinator,

and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the

proposed project.

STRENGTHS:

The applicant proposes a comprehensive plan for the management of the project with a project

oversight committee, a project management team and a school management team. Roles are

clearly described. The principal, parents, students and community members may participate in multiple ways, including through a school steering committee that provides project oversight for

each school.

The training and experience of the project director are appropriate. She has nearly 15 years

experience managing similar grants (GEAR UP) and working in community schools in this

community.

WEAKNESSES:

The existing personnel and the job descriptions do not reflect or require community level or

family engagement experiences. The parental/community engagement strands of this work will be challenging based on the needs and conditions described by the applicant so it is important

to staff the position with professionals who are skilled and sensitive to the demands of working

with the community and families. At least one school serves a majority Hispanic speaking

neighborhood so seeking bilingual Spanish speakers should have been listed as a preferred skill

for employment as an outreach worker.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 22

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

4. (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project.

(2) In determining the quality of the project services, the Secretary considers the following:

(i) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date

knowledge from research and effective practice; and

(ii) The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will lead to

improvements in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic

standards.

STRENGTHS:

The applicant provides solid research on the effectiveness of arts integrated education, parental

involvement and mentoring. The evidence they provide includes evaluation studies based on their own programming and in some cases in the same or very similar schools. For example,

research studies are cited that demonstrate the link between arts integration and improved student achievement. In addition, they present evidence linking parental participation in

training programs directly to student achievement increases.

WEAKNESSES:

The applicant presents research that is largely based on programs where the arts are integrated

into the school day, not offered as an after-school enrichment activity as is the case here. The application would have been strengthened by discussing dosage/frequency of around mentoring

and parental involvement to gauge efficacy of interventions.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 18

5. (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed

project.

(2) In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the extent to which

the proposed evaluation:

(i) Will provide timely and valid information on the management, implementation, or

efficiency of the project; and

(ii) Will provide guidance on or strategies for replicating or testing the project intervention in

multiple settings.

(iii) Will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

STRENGTHS:

The evaluator interacts with the project management team in a number of ways, providing

feedback on a monthly basis. This frequent sharing of information will help project managers

continuously reflect on and improve the project design.

This evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies for replicating the project by

documenting key components, processes, structures and strategies that are relevant to project

outcomes. The applicant states they plan to develop a website, manual and DVD (page 30) that

will certainly support replication in new settings.

The thoughtful mix of qualitative and quantitative data, collected regularly and analyzed

frequently, will provide valid and reliable performance data information.

WEAKNESSES:

None noted.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority: Promise Zones - Promise Zones

1. The Secretary gives competitive preference to applications that propose to work with communities that have been awarded a Promise Zone designation. Promise Zone designees have committed to establishing comprehensive, coordinated approaches in order to ensure, among our goals, that America's most vulnerable children succeed from cradle to career. This designation is designed to assist local leaders in creating jobs, increasing economic activity, improving educational opportunities, leveraging private investment, and reducing violent crime in high-poverty urban, rural, and tribal communities. Promise Zone designations establish comprehensive, coordinated approaches in order to ensure America's most vulnerable children succeed from cradle to career. By partnering with Promise Zones designees, the Federal government will help communities access the resources and expertise they need--including the resources from various neighborhood revitalization initiatives--to ensure that Federal programs and resources support the efforts to transform these communities.

Strengths

None noted.

Weaknesses

The applicant is not in a designated Promise Zone.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 0

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

Fiscal Year 2014	CFDA/Subprogram	84.215J	Schedule	1	Tier	1
			No		No.	

Panel Full Service Community

Name Schools - 12

Applicant Name Columbia College Chicago PR/Award No U215J140035

Questions

		Points Possible	Points Scored		
1. Selection Criteria					
Project Design		25	24		
Adequacy of Resources		20	20		
Management Plan		25	24		
Project Services		20	19		
Project Evaluation		10	10		
	TOTAL	100	97		

Priority Questions

1. Competitive Preference Priority: Promise Zones

CPP: Promise Zones		3	0
	TOTAL	3	0
	GRAND TOTAL	103	97

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name Columbia College Chicago PR/Award No U215J140035

Reviewer Name

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

- 1. (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project.
 - (2) In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of:
 - (i) The students, students' family members, and community to be served, including information about the demographic characteristics and needs of the students, students' family members, and other community members and the estimated number of individuals to be served; and
 - (ii) The eligible services (as listed in the Absolute Priority described elsewhere in the notice inviting applications) to be provided or coordinated by the applicant and its partner entities, how those services will meet the needs of students, students' family members, and other community members, and the frequency with which those services will be provided to students, students' family members, and community members.

(iii) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.

(iv) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve relevant outcomes using existing funding stream from other programs or policies supported by community State and Federal Resources.

Strengths:

The project will serve approximately 800 students, of whom 96% are low-income, and 600 parents each year in three K-8 Title 1 elementary schools in Chicago. (Abstract) Data on each of the three schools (p3-6) and descriptions of the area's high unemployment and low rates of educational achievement (p4) indicate few safe, out-of-school time options.

The project will provide mentoring, remedial education and family engagement services. Strategies that will address the identified student needs include Out of School Time Arts-Based Learning, artistic and academic enrichment classes (p6-8), sports, recreation and fitness programs (p9), school-based tutoring, college student mentors (p13), cultural experiences, teacher professional development and student service learning. Parents will be offered weekly activities, a Parent Resource Center in each school, and literacy and leadership skill development. (p10-11) The frequency of programs is generally referenced. For example, up to three hours of arts programming will be provided daily. (p9)

The applicant proposes an excellent plan to incorporate project activities into the ongoing work of the applicant and schools beyond the end of the grant. Sustainability planning will take place at the end of the grant at each of the project schools in order to continue partnerships and create a continuation plan (p15). The grant will fund ongoing infrastructure and resources such as manuals and curricula that can be used beyond the end of the grant for sustaining partnerships and project activities (p14).

The applicant operates and will offer numerous arts programs to the participating schools. The U.S. Department of Education, the college and private foundations are funding these efforts, and it is clear that the proposed project benefit from existing related efforts to improve relevant outcomes. (p15)

Weaknesses:

It is not clear if the student support services (p7-10) are offered during in-school or exclusively out-of-school time, or how many students will benefit from the myriad services.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 24

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

2. (1) The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project.

(2) In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers

the following factors:

(i) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources to

be provided by the applicant and consortium partners;

(ii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to

the implementation and success of the project; and

(iii) The extent to which costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be

served and services to be provided.

Strengths:

Columbia College Chicago's Center for Community Arts Partnerships proposes this project in

collaboration with Chicago Public Schools and several are non-profit agencies. The focus on artsbased learning leverages the support of adult and college student artist mentors. (p1) Cash

funding and in-kind resources contributed by the applicant total \$182,900. (p18)

Memorandums of Understanding are included that verify partners' commitments.

Representatives of all partners will serve on oversight groups, including management and school

steering committees. The three partner schools have agreed to support the project with

relevant facilities and equipment. (p16) Principals and representative teachers at the partner schools will also assist with program implementation. Other partners will offer supportive

services. (p17-18)

Costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and services to be

provided, at \$499 per student. (p18) The costs are further leveraged through personnel and

infrastructure capacity that will have a lasting impact.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Question Status: Completed

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 3. (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project.
 - (2) In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
 - (i) The extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of planning, coordination, management, and oversight of the eligible services (as listed in the Absolute Priority described elsewhere in the notice inviting applications) to be provided at each school to be served, including the role of the school principal, the FSCS coordinator, partner entities, parents, and community members;
 - (ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the FSCS coordinator and other key project personnel including prior performance of the applicant on similar or related efforts; and
 - (iii) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director, the FSCS coordinator, and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The project has a comprehensive plan for management and oversight of the eligible services. The applicant has a national reputation for quality arts programs for youth, and has more than fifteen years of experience in partnering with the communities to create partnerships to bring arts to schools. (p2) The applicant has already successfully implemented Community Schools programming in Chicago since 2001 and has successfully managed and operated several multi-year federal, state and local grants and contracts for arts integration. (p23)

Three organizational structures have been developed to address planning and management of the project objectives; teams meet frequently to address services and improvements. These teams include a Project Oversight Committee, on which the principals and parents will serve (p19), the Project Management Team, and School Steering Committees which also include the principal, parents and partners. Each team is effectively explained with appropriate roles (p19-20) in planning and management. The commitment of the principal is seen as a key component to ensure effective coordination. (p20)

Full-time school-based FSCS Resource Coordinators will be responsible for coordinating services

at the site level. (p21) The Resource Coordinators will have dual accountability and responsibility to the Principal and the Project Director. (p20-21) These positions will require bachelor's degree

in education or a related field and experience in or understanding of out-of-school time

programs. (p21)

Time commitments are clearly delineated. The Project Director will spend 50% of time on the

project, assisted by a full-time Resource Coordinator (p21) and other part-time staff whose

responsibilities and qualifications are identified and appropriate. (p22-3)

Weaknesses:

Some important elements of the staffing plan are missing, including qualifications and

supervision of staff members. For the identified schools' populations, bilingual staff would be

important to providing appropriate services. The qualifications of staff that will provide families with the variety of indicated services such as adult literacy, connections to family resources, and

leadership instruction are not indicated. (p21-22)

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 24

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

(1) The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project.

(2) In determining the quality of the project services, the Secretary considers the following:

(i) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date

knowledge from research and effective practice; and

(ii) The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will lead to

improvements in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic

standards.

Strengths:

Research is presented that substantiates the effectiveness of an arts-integrated design in serving

students with different learning styles, and in improving academic achievement. (p25) Similarly,

the parent involvement and mentoring components are supported with studies demonstrating

their role in increasing academic performance. (p26)

There is a clear indication that the arts programs the applicant runs have an impact on student

achievement. The applicant has a proven track record that has resulted in improvements in

student achievement as measured against rigorous academic standards. An example of the

positive impact of the applicant is shown in (p27) past results of an increase in writing and math resulting from a mentoring program. In addition they have a strong Parent Information

Resource Center program that has shown an increase in students performing at grade level.

(p27-28)

Weaknesses:

It is not clearly stated that the programs the applicant runs are the ones that will be

implemented in the out-of-school time activities that are proposed in this project. If the

applicant will implement other curricula or programs, these are not described and it cannot be determined if these will reflect current knowledge of best practices or be linked to student

achievement.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 19

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

5. (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed

project.

(2) In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the extent to which

the proposed evaluation:

(i) Will provide timely and valid information on the management, implementation, or

efficiency of the project; and

(ii) Will provide guidance on or strategies for replicating or testing the project intervention in

multiple settings.

(iii) Will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

Strengths:

The comprehensive evaluation plan will provide timely and valid information on the management, implementation, and efficiency of the project. Implementation teams and staff

will receive monthly feedback (p28) from the evaluator, who will use multiple formative

assessments (p28-9), quantitative and qualitative measures and a change process based on evaluation results. The project will establish baseline measurements (p32) for monitoring

effectiveness.

There is a clear commitment of the applicant to ensure the evaluation and planning provides

guidance on replicating the project intervention in multiple settings. The applicant has developed an arts-focused school model that it will continue to implement. (p14) The quality

evaluation plan will ensure that resulting strategies for replication are shared and able to be implemented in similar diverse urban schools. A manual, DVD, and website will be made

available to share the project's lessons learned. . (p30)

The project evaluation is designed to provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. Assessment instruments and performance measures have been set for each

outcome. (p33-35) The expected outcomes are to increase student academic achievement, community engagement, increase parents' family literacy skills, and support youth

development. There is a clear focus on measures that create stronger youth development

outcomes. (Abstract)

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority: Promise Zones - Promise Zones

1. The Secretary gives competitive preference to applications that propose to work with communities that have been awarded a Promise Zone designation. Promise Zone designees have committed to establishing comprehensive, coordinated approaches in order to ensure, among our

goals, that America's most vulnerable children succeed from cradle to career. This designation is

designed to assist local leaders in creating jobs, increasing economic activity, improving

educational opportunities, leveraging private investment, and reducing violent crime in high-poverty urban, rural, and tribal communities. Promise Zone designations establish comprehensive, coordinated approaches in order to ensure America's most vulnerable children succeed from cradle to career. By partnering with Promise Zones designees, the Federal government will help communities access the resources and expertise they need--including the resources from various neighborhood revitalization initiatives--to ensure that Federal programs and resources support the efforts to transform these communities.

Strengths

None.

Weaknesses

Promise Zones are not addressed in this application for Chicago schools.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 0

Technical Review Cover Sheet

Panel Details

Fiscal Year 2014	CFDA/Subprogram 84.2	15J Schedule	1 Tier	1
		No	No	

Panel Full Service Community

Name Schools - 12

Applicant Name Columbia College Chicago PR/Award No U215J140035

Questions

		Points Possible	Points Scored		
1. Selection Criteria					
Project Design		25	24		
Adequacy of Resources		20	20		
Management Plan		25	24		
Project Services		20	19		
Project Evaluation		10	10		
	TOTAL	100	97		

Priority Questions

1. Competitive Preference Priority: Promise Zones

CPP: Promise Zones		3	0
	TOTAL	3	0
	GRAND TOTAL	103	97

Technical Review Form

Applicant Name Columbia College Chicago PR/Award No U215J140035

Reviewer Name

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

- 1. (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project.
 - (2) In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of:
 - (i) The students, students' family members, and community to be served, including information about the demographic characteristics and needs of the students, students' family members, and other community members and the estimated number of individuals to be served; and
 - (ii) The eligible services (as listed in the Absolute Priority described elsewhere in the notice inviting applications) to be provided or coordinated by the applicant and its partner entities, how those services will meet the needs of students, students' family members, and other community members, and the frequency with which those services will be provided to students, students' family members, and community members.

- (iii) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the applicant beyond the end of the grant.
- (iv) The extent to which the proposed project will integrate with or build on similar or related efforts to improve relevant outcomes using existing funding stream from other programs or policies supported by community State and Federal Resources.

STRENGTHS

The project will serve approximately 800 students and 600 parents each year in three K-8 schools: Crown Community Academy, Mahalia Jackson Elementary School, and Sabin Magnet School.

The students in North Lawndale have few safe options for out of school time programs that focus on the arts and academics. While some health, educational and social services are available, not all parents are aware of the services, and the level of need in the neighborhood exceeds capacity. The high crime rate negatively impacts the safety of residents and students. Auburn Gresham school ranked 4th in America for violent crime in 2013. Mahalia Jackson School has a significant special needs population including students who are hard of hearing and autistic. Many parents lack a deep understanding of the developmental needs of their children and strategies to support children in meeting higher educational and occupational goals.

The applicant plans to meet the educational, personal, and social developmental needs of K-8 students, and to build the parental involvement and family literacy skills of their parents in partnership with the Chicago Public Schools (LEA), the Illinois Federation for Community Schools, Lawndale Amachi Mentorship Program, Girls in the Game, Common Threads, and United Way of Metropolitan Chicago.

The proposal presents a detailed table (page 3) of the 2013 characteristics and academic performance of each of the three target schools. These data describe a student population that, among other characteristics, is predominately low income, non-white, and academically well below state average in reading and math.

The goals of the proposed project relate to the identified characteristics: 1) To support student achievement and healthy development; 2) To engage parents as partners in supporting their children's learning and development; and 3) To eliminate barriers to learning.

The applicant plans to address these goals through the following three services (pages 6-14):

(1) Remedial education through a.) Arts-Based Learning, b) Fostering Teamwork, c) Tutoring and Academic Support, d) Academic Enrichment, and f) Professional Development;

(2) Family engagement through Family Literacy and Parent Leadership Development; and

(3) Mentoring, Relationship Development, and College Readiness Activities.

The applicant is commended for the thoroughness with which activities have been planned to provide these services. For example (page 8), each class will range from 10 to 25 students, depending on the activity. Classes will have an instructor-to-student ratio of 1:15. College student assistants will work in larger classes or activities, especially those in which students work in small groups such as filmmaking and music production. Each activity will take place two days per week (Monday/Wednesday or Tuesday/Thursday) for 1.5 to 2 hours. Up to 3 hours of programming will take place each day, and will be offered 4 to 5 days a week, depending on the school's schedule, for a minimum of 12 hours a week. Instructors will include Columbia College faculty, alumni, and practicing artists, who will serve as mentors to students. By working with artists, students will be introduced to possible careers in the arts and other professions, exposing them to possible occupations.

CCAP has designed the project in order to incorporate the purposes, activities, and benefits of the project into its ongoing work beyond the end of the grant through several measures. For example, the FSCS grant will allow infrastructure and resources to be created that can be used for sustaining partnerships and project activities at each of the project schools, as well as disseminating the model to new partner schools in the future. These resources include: a manual with templates, sample class curricula with student artwork, photo and video

documentation, and a final evaluation report (page 14).

WEAKNESS

The applicant states that the project will integrate and build on its proposed and similar efforts by using existing funding streams from other programs (page 15), but does not provide significant or sufficient details as to how or when it will do so.

Question Status:Completed

Reviewer Score: 24

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

2. (1) The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project.

(2) In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers

the following factors:

(i) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources to

be provided by the applicant and consortium partners;

(ii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to

the implementation and success of the project; and

(iii) The extent to which costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be

served and services to be provided.

STRENGTHS

The applicant has drawn on its experience in operating community schools. They are able to

accurately estimate what needs to be budgeted for program equipment and supplies such as art class supplies, media technology equipment, sports equipment, and supplies for professional

development,

The three partner schools have agreed in their MOUs (Appendix B) to support the project with

appropriate facilities and equipment. For example, the schools have indicated that they will

provide the project with the use of audiovisual equipment, classrooms, and auditorium usage. All of the schools have also agreed to open their facilities to students and parents during after

school hours and on Saturdays.

The facilities of Columbia College Chicago will be available as sites for field trips, mentoring

programs, culminating events, and summer classes. Community partners will provide

appropriate facilities, equipment and supplies.

As outlined in the budget narrative, costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to

be served and services to be provided.

NO WEAKNESSES NOTED

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 3. (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project.
 - (2) In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
 - (i) The extent to which the proposed project consists of a comprehensive plan that includes a description of planning, coordination, management, and oversight of the eligible services (as listed in the Absolute Priority described elsewhere in the notice inviting applications) to be provided at each school to be served, including the role of the school principal, the FSCS coordinator, partner entities, parents, and community members;
 - (ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the FSCS coordinator and other key project personnel including prior performance of the applicant on similar or related efforts; and
 - (iii) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director, the FSCS coordinator, and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

STRENGTHS

Three organizational structures have been developed to address planning, management, coordination, and oversight of the project (pages 18 - 20). Their membership, frequency of meetings and responsibilities are clearly presented as evidenced by the following.

- (1) The Project Oversight Committee meets regularly and is made up of representatives from all the major stakeholders (page 19).
- (2) The Project Management Team consists of the full-time Project Director, the Executive Director, the Community Schools staff, Resource Coordinators, and the Budget and Operations Manager. This group oversees and manages a comprehensive schedule of project processes and procedures.
- (3) Each School Steering Committee includes the principal, Resource Coordinator, partner entities, parents, teachers, students, and members of the community. These committees create site-based implementation plans and revise them as needed.

Each school will also create a student advisory committee. This group will meet with the steering committee or as a separate committee to ensure student voice in planning services.

Oversight of qualified program services at each school will be shared between the Resource Coordinator and the Project Director in consultation with the principal, School Steering Committee, and Project Management Team.

CCAP will employ full-time school-based FSCS Resource Coordinators who will be responsible for

coordinating services at the site level. They will work closely with the principal, staff and

students to ensure that program delivery is smooth and effective.

A Project Director (50%) is responsible for overall management of out-of-school programs (page

21).

The applicant describes the appropriate qualifications of each position, details of how existing

staff meets them, and specifies qualifications for each position yet to be filled (page 17 and appendices A & B), and the budget narrative confirms that the time commitments of the project

director, the FSCS coordinator, and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate

to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

WEAKNESS

The applicants presents a case that over 20% of students at Sabin are limited English proficient

and thus face multiple barriers to making progress in core academic subjects (page 9)> The application would have been strengthened if job descriptions included individuals with bilingual

abilities.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 24

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Services

4. (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project.

(2) In determining the quality of the project services, the Secretary considers the following:

(i) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date

knowledge from research and effective practice; and

(ii) The likelihood that the services to be provided by the proposed project will lead to

improvements in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic

standards.

STRENGTHS

The three service areas proposed by the applicant are supported by research; cited, for

example, is the significant statistical relationships between arts education and student achievement by Rabkin & Redmond (Putting the Arts in the Picture, 2004; Center for Arts

Education, Staying in School: Arts Education and New York City High School Graduation Rates,

2009). Other supporting research is cited supporting parent involvement in increasing children's

academic performance, and the contribution of mentoring to improving academic performance

and personal development.

Planned activities and eligible services relate to these citations and address expected outcomes.

Delivered as planned, these activities have the potential to lead to improvements in the

achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards.

The applicant is commended for including extensive Professional Development (PD) to support

students academically. Teaching artists and college student mentors will participate in monthly 2-hour PD sessions to prepare them for effective mentoring and teaching in out of school

programming.

The applicant has demonstrated past success with projects similar to the proposed that have

been implemented by CCAP which have led to improvements in the achievement of students as

measured against rigorous academic standards. One such project was Project AIM, a mentorship

project that implemented an arts integrated curriculum in out-of-school time. This and other

examples suggest the likelihood that the proposed FSCS project will have a similar impact.

WEAKNESS

The research cited in pages 24 and 25 does not support, as claimed, the provision of out of

school time arts-based learning as described on page7 since the research cited refers to in

school time art programs of a different nature.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 19

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

5. (1) The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed

project.

(2) In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the extent to which

the proposed evaluation:

(i) Will provide timely and valid information on the management, implementation, or

efficiency of the project; and

(ii) Will provide guidance on or strategies for replicating or testing the project intervention in

multiple settings.

(iii) Will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

STRENGTHS

The Project Management Team will be responsible for managing the project's evaluation design.

This group will work with an external Evaluator and the Project Director to refine the evaluation design, implement it, and report quarterly to the Project Oversight Committee on formative and

summative evaluation results.

The applicant proposes a logical process to measure and manage progress towards the project's

stated goals and objectives. Benchmarks and timelines will be set to annually gauge the extent to which the project's activities are meeting program objectives, and a range of formative

evaluation measures will be employed to provide additional on-going and continuous feedback

on the project's progress.

The Project Management Team will fully document not only what impact the project has had on

participants, but also what problems and difficulties have been encountered in implementing the project's design. In this way, extensive guidance will be provided for replication by providing

adopters with detailed assistance with the development of this project's activities.

A central data bank will be established to systematically keep track of all quantitative data on

participants which will be collected in various ways including tests and surveys.

Staff will regularly review evaluation data, curriculum guides, and sample projects posted on the

website to consider changes in project design.

NO WEAKNESS NOTED

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority: Promise Zones - Promise Zones

1. The Secretary gives competitive preference to applications that propose to work with

communities that have been awarded a Promise Zone designation. Promise Zone designees have

committed to establishing comprehensive, coordinated approaches in order to ensure, among our

goals, that America's most vulnerable children succeed from cradle to career. This designation is designed to assist local leaders in creating jobs, increasing economic activity, improving

educational opportunities, leveraging private investment, and reducing violent crime in high-

poverty urban, rural, and tribal communities. Promise Zone designations establish comprehensive,

coordinated approaches in order to ensure America's most vulnerable children succeed from

cradle to career. By partnering with Promise Zones designees, the Federal government will help communities access the resources and expertise they need--including the resources from various

neighborhood revitalization initiatives--to ensure that Federal programs and resources support

the efforts to transform these communities.

Strengths

N/A. Applicant did not respond to the CPP.

Weaknesses

N/A. Applicant did not respond to the CPP.

Question Status: Completed

Reviewer Score: 0